



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

vindicate Islam and so cannot help introducing into it the spirit of progress.

In such things as these, and in the young men who come from those far lands to study at their universities, men like Snouck Hurgronje and Max Horten, who know their Islam and Arabic passing well, see tokens of a new awakening for the Moslem East. An interest in natural sciences from the new European viewpoint is manifest; the writer recalls with particular pleasure how a party of well-to-do men in the Young Turks' Club at fanatical Nablus (Shechem) not many years ago were ready to retain him on the spot, so that he might teach them and their sons European manners and methods. It was this very interest, chiefly, that changed the world-view

and struck an aging world from under the feet of Europe, and forced it to build on the ruins that new one which we call the modern. If, then, America, too, should take an interest in this world's work from this angle and help to give to the great world of Islam this elixir of life to renew therewith its own civilization in the way which it finds best suited to itself, then this country will therewith be doing something of its plain, human duty, something which will redound not only to the fame but incidentally also to the lasting profit of America itself; and something which, it is to be hoped, may some day become known generally, as it is now appreciated in the Levant, as a characteristically American deed.

THE VALUE OF BIBLICAL ARCHAEOLOGY

REV. G. H. RICHARDSON, PH.D.

Bunker Hill, Illinois

Archaeology is sometimes believed to be as dead as the bones it exhumes, but just at present it is extremely alive. DR. RICHARDSON has already set forth the contradictory uses to which the science can be applied by extremists. Now he writes more constructively and positively. As a matter of fact, archaeology is a good servant but a poor master.

In three earlier numbers of the *Biblical World*¹ I dealt with the abuse of biblical archaeology and raised a protest against the methods employed by both the ultra-conservatives and the ultra-liberals in dealing with archaeology in their theorizing. In this article I wish to deal with the "better way," and to show the value of archaeology for the

Bible student. It is to be regretted that the extremists on both sides have tended to bring the whole study into disrepute, it being said of archaeology, as it is still said of the Bible, "You can make it prove anything."

Why do two opposing schools take the same archaeological facts and yet reach such vastly differing conclusions,

¹ August, 1915, February, March, 1916.

each claiming that the "finds" support its theory, when their theories are as far apart as the poles? What proves to one side that the Israelites were never in Egypt is the "unassailable proof" to the other that they were, and that the biblical story is correct even to details. What proves to one that the Exodus journey must have been to the traditional Sinai in the Peninsula is to another a positive proof that Sinai was in Edom. What proves to one that the patriarchs were mythical, or personifications, or personified tribes, proves to another that they were individuals of flesh and blood. And so one could go on. There is some reason for such divergences, and it is necessary to find the reason; for it is disconcerting to the beginner in these studies to find Dr. Driver, a recognized leader in critical matters, writing: "The idea that the monuments furnish a refutation of the general critical position is a pure illusion,"¹ and then to turn round and find Canon Sayce writing: "Wherever archaeology has been able to test the negative conclusions of criticism, they have dissolved like a bubble in the air."² Here, evidently, there is something deeper than a difference of texts, something that is psychological in its nature.

It was a wonderful day for the world when, in 1811, Claudius James Rich attacked the mound of ancient Babylon and unearthed the inscribed bricks, and when he bought the cuneiform tablets from the natives and brought them to England. That was the beginning of

that vast Assyriological collection of the British Museum. But, greater than that, it was the beginning of a lively interest in the remains of that ancient civilization. It was another wonderful day for the world when Paul Emil Botta turned to the mound of Khorsabad and found the palace of Sargon II (722-705 B.C.), for his discovery fired the French government to great undertakings in the fields of Assyriological research. Another wonderful day was when Austen Henry Layard began his first excavations in Assyria and discovered palace after palace, and those little clay tablets which were so soon to revolutionize our knowledge of the past, and, still more significant, the Black Obelisk of Shalmaneser III (860-825 B.C.) with its account of the tribute of Jehu—not to mention other discoveries.

But perhaps the most wonderful day of all was that day in 1872 when George Smith, working in the British Museum among the cuneiform tablets, found the Babylonian legend of the Deluge. Into the story of the excavations we cannot enter at this time, and we must refer the reader to the authorities.³ One of the first motives in excavating the mounds of Babylonia and Assyria, Egypt, Palestine, and Asia Minor, was to discover confirmations for the biblical accounts. In all his writings Layard kept this before him and before the public. George Smith was attracted to Assyriology by the hope of finding confirmations. The

¹ *Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament*, p. xviii.

² *Monumental Facts and Higher Critical Fancies*, p. 25.

³ See Rogers' monumental work on *The History of Babylonia and Assyria* (6th ed.) for a very complete account.

Egypt Exploration Fund was founded "to organize excavations in Egypt, with a view to the further elucidation of the History of Arts of Ancient Egypt, and to the illustration of the Old Testament narrative, in so far as it has to do with Egypt and the Egyptians." The Palestine Exploration Fund is "a Society for the accurate and systematic investigation of the archaeology, the topography, the geology and physical geography, the customs and manners of the Holy Land, for Biblical illustration." Delitzsch sums it all up when he writes: "To what end all this toil and trouble in distant, inhospitable, and danger-ridden lands? Why all this expense in ransacking to their utmost depths the rubbish heaps of forgotten centuries, where we know neither treasures of gold nor of silver exist? Why this zealous emulation on the part of the nations to secure the greatest possible number of mounds for excavation? And whence, too, that constantly increasing interest, that burning enthusiasm, born of generous sacrifice, now being bestowed on both sides the Atlantic on the excavations of Babylonia, and Assyria? One answer echoes to all these questions—one answer, which, if not absolutely adequate, is yet largely the reason and consummation of it all: *the Bible*."¹

So many discoveries were made of the things connected with the Bible, and so strongly did many of the discoveries confirm the biblical record, that it became more and more a fixed and final belief that if we only excavated long enough every detail of the Bible narrative would be confirmed. We have only to think on the enthusiasm which swept

over England and the continent in 1872, after George Smith on December 3 had read his paper before the Society of Biblical Archaeology. Preachers and laymen alike were convinced that even the very stones were crying out against the unbelievers. Did not even pagan Babylon arise to refute the scoffers at the biblical Flood story? The whole Bible is true, it was argued, because another nation had a similar story. The name of Hammurabi was discovered on some monuments, and scholars got to work at once and with some philological twisting "proved" that the "Amraphel" of Gen., chap. 14, was the name of Hammurabi. Again, the Bible was proved true because one of the kings named in it had been discovered. The ruins of Pithom were discovered, and it was noted that some of the bricks toward the top of the chamber walls were peculiar. At first it was stated that they were made without straw, a conclusion since refuted by the breaking and examination of the bricks. But the former theory had the field, and it was argued, and is still argued in spite of the refutation, that the Bible has again been vindicated, because bricks without straw were used by the Israelites. Did not the Exodus with its three millions of Israelites take place just as the Bible stated? The Word of God is able to withstand all the attacks of a blatant unbelief. What are those strange figures carved up there on the rocks throughout Asia Minor, figures with peculiar faces and dresses? And what are these hieroglyphics accompanying the figures? What language do they represent? After a period of

¹ *Babel and Bible*, p. 1.

guesswork it was finally concluded that the figures are those of Hittites and that the hieroglyphics are Hittite. Are not Hittites mentioned in the Bible? They are, in a number of places. Then the Word of God has again been vindicated, it is indeed a tried and true Word, for the monuments have confirmed the story. And thus the conservative scholars went on, and still go on, having gradually developed the idea that all the monuments, when rightly interpreted, support their theory. It is needless to give a list of names in this connection, for every reader of the religious weeklies of a conservative nature is aware how this is stated as if it were axiomatic.

But disturbers arose, as they always do when we get most comfortable. Another school of archaeologists had carefully noted the discoveries made, and interpreted them. Was there a Babylonian story of the Creation and Deluge? Was there a Babylonian record of ten kings, or patriarchs? Has there been discovered a code of laws given by Hammurabi a thousand years before Moses, many details of which look very much like the "Mosaic" law? Have names with a "Jau" element in them been found in Babylonia, and did the owners live in the time of Hammurabi? Then the writers of the Old Testament must have derived their materials from Babylonia, and if so Israel can no longer be regarded as having a unique revelation. Was there a story of a long famine recorded in the tomb of an Egyptian noble of about the (traditional) time of Joseph? Did Merenptah fight against Israel in or near Palestine about the (traditional) date of the Exodus? Was there a people

called Asher in the region of Galilee during the reign of Rameses II? Were there places in Canaan, at the time of Thotmes III, named Jacob-el and Joseph-el, and are these names an indication that Jacob and Joseph were clan or tribal deities? Then the Joseph story is a late story into which have been worked Egyptian elements. Israel could not have been in Egypt, in fact the monuments seem to be entirely against an Egyptian residence. Jacob and Joseph were only later regarded as father and son, for at first they were local deities in Canaan. Is it not possible that the whole tradition of Israel is radically wrong and needs to be rewritten? Have not inscriptions been discovered, written by Assyrian kings, in which there is the name Muzri, given to a district in Northern Arabia; and is it not highly probable that the scribes of Israel, having forgotten the earlier stories of their nation, and now being in definite contact with Egypt, rewrote their text and pointed it so that Muzri reads Mizraim thus bringing the whole tradition into an Egyptian setting instead of a North Arabian? Was there not a Hagarite tribe in Northern Arabia? If this is so, we can place the story of Hagar in its true light. She was simply the name of a tribe which for a time amalgamated with the Abraham tribe, but after a tribal quarrel separated from it. Did not the clan of Jerahmeel play a greater part in the early attempts to conquer Canaan along with Israel than we have hitherto thought, and does it not follow, if this is true, that it must have exerted a great influence on the life and religion of the newcomers? The children of Israel were in Canaan when

Merenptah came up in his fifth year, for they had just come out of their captivity in Northern Arabia. This accounts for the lack of Egyptian influence in the thought of early Israel—they did not come into contact with Egypt until centuries after Merenptah. The Hittites! We have been enabled to trace out their sphere of influence and dominance, and we find that they were hundreds of miles away, north of Hebron at the (traditional) time of Abraham. The story of Abraham and the cave of Machpelah is a late account to support a certain tradition. And so we could go on, for the ultra-liberals have convinced themselves that all the monuments, when rightly interpreted, support their theory. Again, we have no need to give a list of names, for every reader of liberal works is aware how this is stated as if it were axiomatic. More than once we have been asked by beginners to tell them which side they should follow in archaeological writings and it has been difficult at times to know just what to advise; for sometimes both sides have many things the student should know, while at the same time they have many things he needs to omit.

The difference is due, in every case, we believe, to the views of the Bible held by the individual writers. Where a scholar believes that the whole of the Bible as we have it is the veritable Word of God, he cannot believe that it is mistaken in any point, whether in science, history, geography, or morals. When he so believes he feels that it is his great work to defend it against the impugnors of the Word, and, finding such clear cases of confirmation (and

often more cases of illustration than confirmation, though only too often these are not distinguished), he will grasp at these as a drowning man at a straw. There are, we are willing to admit, differing degrees of conservatism, and here we deal with the attitude of the ultra-conservatives. And, so on the other hand, with the ultra-liberal: only too often for him the Bible is simply one out of a number of so-called sacred books of the East. It is a garbled account of an insignificant horde which, coming out of slavery, either in Egypt or Northern Arabia, conquered Canaan, and which, after the conquest, had a very exalted idea of itself and its destiny. To refute the statements of the inhabitants of the conquered land, it invented a number of tales about its ancestors and the dealings of the national god with them. The land was their land by right because their national deity, who owned the land, had promised it to their fathers, etc.

The moderate conservatives have been brought to tone down their former extreme statements through the sheer weight of archaeological evidence (a fact worth remembering when they seek to remind criticism of its changes) for the time being, but they closely watch every discovery in the hope that they can go back to their whole theory and refute those who made them give up a part. It is from this side that we continually hear such statements as, "Archaeology is not yet an exact science"; "It is well to wait for further evidence"; "It is possible that the text does not mean what has been given out"; "Archaeology has not yet proved all the details of the story, but we can

afford to wait, for we are convinced that it will, seeing that it has vindicated so many details in the past"; "The silence of the monuments of this time on our subject has no special significance, as they do not seem to have had special occasion to mention, etc."; "While archaeology does not prove, it does not disprove."

The moderate-liberal position seems to be the position we ought to occupy. Perhaps the moderate conservatives will argue that they are practically one with the moderate liberals, but it is not so. The moderate conservatives are too eager to return to their "whole" theory, while the moderate liberal is ever ready and eager for the larger truth, even though it involves the destruction of all the theories he holds dear; he believes that the past is not of necessity a standard, and that the greater Bible of God is still being written.

When there is, as it were, at the "back of the mind" the theory that all the Bible is marked off from all other literature in some peculiar sense, then a man is concerned about seeing all its statements proved correct, even in details. But when one believes that

God sends His teachers unto every age,
To every clime and every race of men,
With revelations fitted to their growth
And shape of mind, nor gives the realm
of truth
Into the selfish rule of one sole race,

he is more concerned about the message of the Bible than about its historical details, recognizing that, though the

vessel is of common clay, yet the water is still good and can give life to a spiritually thirsty race.

Have we not spent too much time upon the outward Bible and too much neglected the inner Word? Have we not been more concerned about the letter than the spirit? Where people are at all times anxious to prove that the record is correct, even in details, there is a danger that the great truths are lost sight of in the struggle, and the defender is in danger of sacrificing his integrity and lessening his spiritual life because of the method of argument he is often led to employ. Are we not to this day under the influence of antiquated ideas regarding the inspiration of the Bible? Why should it be so necessary to insist that the whole of the Bible is correct when it has to do with history, science, etc? Why all this titanic struggle to reconcile Gen., chaps. 1 and 2, with modern geology, biology, zoology, and to prove that "the geological theory of the flood of Noah as the last great change in land levels is being most exactly confirmed, not only by investigations in glacial history, but by examination of the records of that cataclysm that befell the antediluvian world which are still to be seen written upon the mountains and valleys of Europe and of central and western Asia"?¹ Even to this day we are shown photographs of the very "Asphalt Springs near Hit which furnished 'slime' (asphalt) used by the builders of Babel," Babel here evidently referring to the Babel of Gen., chap. 11, if we are to take the heading of the chapter for a guide;² and we are

¹ Kyle, *The Deciding Voice of the Monuments*, p. 63.

² Clay, *Light on the Old Testament from Babel*, p. 94.

told that the Tower of Babel, mentioned in this chapter of Genesis, is the Ziggurat Babili of Babylon. The time has come for intellectual seriousness in dealing with the Bible, for our intelligent young people are being raised in a vastly different environment from that of their parents—an environment in which the historical method is becoming predominant, and where the old-world legends are being scientifically compared. When they discover in the university classroom that science knows nothing of such a universal deluge as is

implied in the Genesis story, and when they compare the legends of the ancients regarding the origins of peoples and civilizations, what is likely to be their attitude to the books containing such defenses? More than this, what will their attitude be toward the book which needs such defense? We are not at this point attacking writers, for that is not the “way of peace”; rather, we are asking for seriousness and intellectual honesty on the part of those who feel called upon to save the Bible from the hands of the critics.

[To be concluded]